



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

7.
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/030,729

06/20/2002

Ronald Johnston Hill

53-99A

8254

23713

7590

12/14/2006

GREENLEE WINNER AND SULLIVAN P C
4875 PEARL EAST CIRCLE
SUITE 200
BOULDER, CO 80301

EXAMINER

PAK, MICHAEL D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1646

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/030,729	Applicant(s) HILL ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael Pak	Art Unit 1646	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 28-31 and 43-76 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 28-31 and 43-74 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 76 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 75 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8-28-06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Amendment filed October 2, 2006 has been entered.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Applicant's arguments filed October 2, 2006, have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive.
4. This application contains claims 28-31 and 43-74 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper filed December 5, 2005. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.
5. Applicants request rejoinder of amended method claims. Rejoinder will be considered when all the claims are allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1646

6. Claim 75 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 75 recite the term "hybridize under at least moderate stringency conditions" which is a relative term and the metes and bounds of the term is not clear. Hybridization conditions have defined salt and temperature conditions and it is not clear where the boundary for a hybridization condition is low, high or moderate.

7. Claim 75 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a polypeptide comprising SEQ ID NO:40, does not reasonably provide enablement for a polypeptide which has 80% amino acid sequence identity with SEQ ID NO:40 or a polypeptide which is encoded by a nucleic acid which hybridizes at moderate stringency conditions to the deposited plasmid. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claim 75 encompass a large genus of polypeptides because of the recitation of "hybridize under moderate stringency conditions." Nucleic acids which hybridize under moderate stringency conditions encompass unlimited number of nucleic acids because metes and bounds of the term is not set and encompass any salt and temperature conditions regardless of wash conditions. Claims encompass a large genus of

Art Unit: 1646

polypeptides because of the recitation of 80% sequence identity with SEQ ID NO:40. However, the specification only disclose a B. Tabacai USP comprising SEQ ID NO:40. The specification does not teach a large genus of polypeptides. At the time of the invention, one of skilled in the art was not aware of a large genus of polypeptides without USP function but rather was aware of the specific species of USP (see Oro et al. (US 5,688,691)). It would require undue experimentation for one skilled in the art to make and use the large genus of polypeptides which is not functional.

The first paragraph of § 112 requires that the patent specification enable "those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation." Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk AIS, 108 F.3d 1361, 1365, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1004 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (quoting In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)); see also In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). ("[T]he scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation to the scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art."). Whether making and using the invention would have required undue experimentation, and thus whether the disclosure is enabling is a legal conclusion based upon several underlying factual inquiries. See In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 735, 736-37, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1402, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As set forth in Wands, the factors to be considered in determining whether a claimed invention is enabled throughout its scope without undue experimentation include the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the

Art Unit: 1646

prior art, the relative skill of those in the art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and the breadth of the claims.

Likewise, in Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co., 927 F.2d 1200, 18 USPQ2d 1016 (Fed. Cir. 1991), the court affirmed the holding of invalidity of claims to analogs of the EPO gene under § 112 for lack of enablement where applicants had claimed every possible analog of the EPO gene but had disclosed only how to make EPO and a very few analogs. "[D]espite extensive statements in the specification concerning all analogs of the EPO gene that can be made, there is little enabling disclosure of the particular analogs and how to make them There may be many other genetic sequences that code for EPO-type products. Amgen has told how to make and use only a few of them and is therefore not entitled to claim all of them." *Id.*, 927 F.2d at 1213-14, 18 USPQ2d at 1027.

Claims are too broad to be enabled by a specification that provides only examples of an embodiment of the claimed invention using SEQ ID NO:40. The specification only describes using the method with SEQ ID NO:40. The amount of direction provided in the specification is limited to using the method with SEQ ID NO:40 and does not teach how to make and use a derivative with unlimited changes to SEQ ID NO:40 and which has USP function. Without determining how to make and use a derivative with a large number of changes to SEQ ID NO:40 and which has function, claim requires undue experimentation to determine how to make and use a derivative with a large number of changes to SEQ ID NO:40 and which has USP function. Thus, the state of the art appears to be evolving, rather than mature.

Therefore, based on the above Wands analysis, a preponderance of the evidence supports a conclusion that one skilled in the art would not have been enabled to make and use the invention of claim 1 without undue experimentation.

8. Claim 75 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The instant specification does not contain a written description of the invention in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms or in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing.

Claim 75 encompass a large genus of polypeptides because of the recitation of "hybridize under moderate stringency conditions." Nucleic acid s which hybridize under moderate stringency conditions encompass unlimited number of nucleic acids because metes and bounds of the term is not set and encompass any salt and temperature conditions regardless of wash conditions. The claims are drawn to a polypeptide which is a variant without function because of the claim limitation of 80% amino acid sequence identity with SEQ ID NO:40.

The specification discloses an isolated polypeptide sequence of SEQ ID NO: 40. The instant disclosure of one distinct polypeptide does not adequately describe the scope of the claimed genus, which encompasses a substantial variety of subgenera including full-length, truncated, fusion polypeptides and variants thereof; and

Art Unit: 1646

compositions comprising said polypeptides. a description of a genus of polypeptides may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of polypeptides, defined by an amino acid sequence, falling within the scope of the genus or of a recitation of structural and functional features common to members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus. *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 119 F3d 1559, 1569, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The instant specification fails to provide sufficient descriptive information, such as definitive structural or functional features of the claimed genus of polypeptides. There is no description of the conserved regions which are critical to the structure and function of the genus claimed. The claims encompass a variant derivative but do not disclose the critical technical feature of the claimed invention or its relationship to function. A polypeptide comprising a fragment of SEQ ID NO:40 may be completely unrelated to the disclosed USP, having a different function or even be inactive. The critical technical feature encompassed by specific residues must relate the encompassed polypeptide, structurally and functionally to the disclosed USP of SEQ ID NO:40. The specification proposes to discover other members of the genus by using hybridization techniques. There is no description, however, of the sites at which variability may be tolerated and there is no information regarding the relation of structure to function. Structural features that could distinguish the compounds in the genus from others excluded are missing from the disclosure. Furthermore, the prior art does not provide compensatory structural or correlative teachings sufficient to enable one of skill to isolate and identify the polypeptides encompassed and no identifying characteristic or property of the instant

polypeptides is provided such that one of skill would be able to predictably identify the encompassed molecules as being identical to those instantly claimed.

The specification further fails to identify and describe the regulatory regions essential to the function of the claimed invention, which are required since the claimed invention currently encompasses the full length, truncated, fusion polypeptides and variants thereof. Since the disclosure fails to describe the common attributes or characteristics that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, the disclosure of the ability to produce USP, is insufficient to describe the genus. One of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe and enable the genus as broadly claimed.

An adequate written description of a protein, requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties, not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention. Accordingly, an adequate written description of a protein is more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it; what is required is a description of the protein itself. Accordingly, the specification does not provide a written description of the invention of claim 25.

9. Claims 76 is allowed.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1646

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pak whose telephone number is 571-272-0879. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 2:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Nickol can be reached on 571-272-0835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/030,729

Page 10

Art Unit: 1646


Michael Pak
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1646
9 December 2006